

BSUFA Meet and Confer Minutes
29 Oct 2008 7:30 am

Attending: Quistgaard, Erickson, Maki, Erwin; Donna Palivec, Brown, Cutler, Smith, Peterson, Wolf, Morgan (recorder).

Maki distributed the Athletic Reorganization Proposal and made some comments on it.

Highlights

Today, what's running us is budget. Specifically, the assumptions we used when we brought our proposal to M/C in 2007. We tried our best to meet these. They are listed in paras 1 - 5 on page 1.

Page 2 of the proposal addresses context. It's important to know who our peers are for competition. Note that the costs affiliated with hockey are fixed costs. We can't simply cut 10 or 20%. Travel costs have gone through the roof.

Why is BSU struggling fundingwise with the sports we have? Look to our peers. Those universities that have same programs we do are larger or private. We have too many programs to afford.

We also want to minimize the impact on employees.

Recommendations

Cut men's track. This does not eliminate a position. We then restructure to realign our priorities. We have 360 athletes. Our idea is to move towards 50/50 men/women. This means decreasing men's side and increasing women's. We can do it by reallocating dollars. Each side would have a goal to meet.

Increase athletic fee to \$70. We offer the same sports as SCSU, which has more more student fee dollars to work with. The problem we're having is that we're underfunding our programs. We're at bottom of 14 schools. That puts our coaches and athletes at a competitive disadvantage

Cut the ice at John Glas Main driver for this: We need a big investment to keep the ice: new equipment. We can relocate hockey to the Event Center. Another option would be to eliminate M100.

It will take us 3 - 5 years to restructure. This plan reduces number of athletes from 360 to 330.

We also expect an NCAA grant coming for 2010 - 11.

Discussion

Brown: We reserve right to have another meeting within 10 days and no action will be

taken until then.

Donna: Palivek Speaking from the big picture. The conference requires particular sports, but the restructuring plan is heavy on team sports rather than individual. We understand that teams = revenue.

The seasons dictate our ability to compete and we have programs that take up a lot of classtime such as baseball and softball. I'm surprized that NSIC wouldn't give us other options.

I'm standing up for the diversity of athletics in track. We bring in a lot of teams from high school in track meets. That's a big picture for BSU. Will this continue under the restructuring. Track meets are big door for us.

DP: Will track meets continue?

Maki: I don't know.

DP: Has there been any lobbying with NSIC to change their demands on seasons?

Q: We have had discussions.

E: We're not the only school.

Q: There hasn't been much sympathy for either.

M: NSIC demands that we start our games in Feb.

Brown: The answer is no.

DP: How feasible is it to increase the numbers in women's sport to make sure Title IX is being addressed?

Q: That will be extra dollars.

M: Our numbers are lower than other schools.

DP: We have had national success in track.

Q: We have more with baseball.

M: How common is it to have men's track without women's track?

DP: Do we know what they're success is?

Maki: We don't know. We can get that information.

DP: Division 1 is about revenue. Division 3 about the athlete. Division 2 is sort of schizophrenic. But it's important for athletes to have something to compete for.

Q: The difficulty is raising dollars for Division 2.

DP leaves at 8:15

Peterson: A clarification: Are you looking to shift funding from men to women? In Appendix III: Are you assuming that hockey will be self sufficient in 5 years?

M: Yes. After 5 years we should be breaking even or making a bit.

Peterson: Is there savings in dropping men's track or is there simply a shift to women's?

M: There's some savings. In today's environment, it's a shift.

Peterson: Are you putting a cap on the revised figures?

M: The numbers of players will be reduced. Coach may not take that well. But to cut the pool to 104 is not unreasonable.

Q: The big challenge is enrollment. We ask a team to drop their numbers and we have to increase enrollment to cover.

Brown: Who was consulted on this?

M: Title IX. The athletic director met with the coaches, all in spring. We had some general numbers but nothing specific at the time.

Brown: Has there been a cost / benefit analysis? Is cutting track enough offset to cover the increase in hockey?

M: (?)

Brown: We recall the language of participation in WCHA. We recalled it as stronger than phrased here.

M: This is the language brought forward.

Brown: Did you look at alumni impact?

M: Men's basketball and golf have multiple endowments. Men's track did not. Alumni impact has been considered.

Cutler: Any consideration given to the Nov 4 elections and the impact on event center?

M: BSU's position is that the event center is moving forward. We assume. We sold suites. Coaches' offices would move to the center.

Cutler: What is going to fill the hole in Glas?

Q: That would be filled by M100. There will be savings in eliminating the ice to cover some of the uses of Glas and a move to the event center.

Adjourned at 8:28 am/

Next M/C is on Nov 12th, 2008

Submitted: M C Morgan